

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

|                                    |   |                         |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| STEVE L. DAVIS,                    | ) | CASE NO. 4:12CV3068     |
|                                    | ) |                         |
| Plaintiff,                         | ) |                         |
|                                    | ) |                         |
| v.                                 | ) | MEMORANDUM<br>AND ORDER |
|                                    | ) |                         |
| DENISE M. LUCKS, Clerk of the U.S. | ) |                         |
| District Court for the District of | ) |                         |
| Nebraska,                          | ) |                         |
|                                    | ) |                         |
| Defendant.                         | ) |                         |

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's Objection to Dismiss, which the court liberally construes as a motion to alter or amend a judgment, filed pursuant to [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59\(e\)](#). (Filing No. [13](#).) In his Motion, Plaintiff seeks reconsideration and reversal of the court's June 19, 2012, Memorandum and Order which dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint because it failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. (Filing No. [11](#).) The court has carefully reviewed Plaintiff's Motion and finds no good cause for amendment or alteration of any portion of its June 19, 2012, Memorandum and Order.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that: Plaintiff's Objection to Dismiss, construed as a motion to alter or amend a judgment, (Filing No. [13](#)) is denied.

DATED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp  
Chief United States District Judge

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.